

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. APPLICATION NO. 09/390,389 09/03/1999 HUI-LING LOU 13-13 6784

03/25/2004

JOSEPH B. RYAN RYAN, MASON & LEWIS, LLP 90 FOREST AVENUE LOCUST VALLEY, NY 11560

EXAMINER BURD, KEVIN MICHAEL

PAPER NUMBER

**ART UNIT** 2631

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/390,389	LOU ET AL.
Havisory House	Examiner	Art Unit
	Kevin M Burd	2631
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address		
THE REPLY FILED 11 March 2004 FAILS TO PLACE TI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to av final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]		
<ul> <li>a)</li></ul>	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final rejection. IE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).		
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:		
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);		
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);		
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or		
(d) they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.
NOTE:		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).		
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.		
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.		
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected:		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	oved or b) disapproved by th	ne Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		
10.□ Other:	Smanantu Rus	in Mr Burel
PATENT SYMMED		

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03)



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants argument are substantially the same a the arguments submitted in the previous response, these arguments were addressed in the previous office action. Applicant argues the limitations of claims 10 and 21 are not taught by the prior art. However, karz discloses in figure 5.28, a selector as defined in the previous office action and data is left shifted between an output of one component and an input to another component.